

## REMARKS

### Claim Changes

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2; claim 2 is canceled.

No amendment made is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment is made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment is made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment is intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

### Objection to the Claims

In response to the objection to claims 1 and 2 for informalities, Applicant has reworded claim 1 and has canceled claim 2.

Rejection of Claims 1-10, 15-20, 22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 3,900,823 (Sokal) in view of US 5,955,921 (Ide).

Applicant respectfully traverses in part and amends in part. Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the invention. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-10, 15-20, 22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sokal in view Ide.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Sokal and Ide does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in independent claim 1, as amended. Specifically, independent claim 1 recites "threshold signal T applies a non-constant transfer function..." which is not taught or suggested in the combination of Sokal and Ide. Since the combination of Sokal and Ide fails to disclose Applicant's claimed invention as claimed in independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a). Applicant requests that claim 1 now be passed to allowance.

Ide describes an AGC amplifier circuit comprising an automatic threshold value setting portion. The automatic threshold value setting portion generates a threshold signal using the peaks of the input signal. Abstract. The threshold signal is varied in a manner such that output from the AGC amplifier(3) falls within a linear range of the AGC amplifier circuit (Col. 30, lines 50-65). Ide also discloses that the threshold signal is applied at an inverting input portion of an AGC amplifier circuit. Ide also discloses a voltage dividing circuit 25 that includes constant resistances 25A and 25B (Fig. 5) that are connected in series b/w the output terminal of the peak detecting circuit and an output terminal of the bottom detecting circuit (Col. 16, lines 5-25).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the statement on page 5, of the Office Action dated 07/19/2007 that the combination of Sokal and Ide describes “threshold signal T applies a non-constant transfer function...” The Office Action specifically refers to abstract and lines 29-67 of Col. 31 of Ide as describing or being analogous to “threshold signal T applies a non-constant transfer function...” This analogy is, however, a mischaracterization of Ide because Ide just discloses a variable threshold signal that depends on the peaks of the input signal and not on a transfer function. Even if Ide’s threshold signal depends upon the transfer function, Applicant would like to bring the Examiner’s attention to the fact that Ide’s transfer function is constant as it depends on two constant resistances 25A and 25B as shown in Ide’s Fig. 5. Applicant’s claimed invention, on the other hand, recites that that the “threshold signal T applies a non-constant transfer function...” which is neither disclosed nor suggested by Ide. The use of a threshold signal that applies a “non-constant transfer function” to the input facilitates being able to dynamically vary the threshold so as to linearize the amplitude relationship between the input and output signals. (Applicant’s Page 5, lines 19-22 and Page 6, lines 28-31).

Therefore, the combination of Sokal and Ide do not teach or suggest the claim limitation of “threshold signal T applies a non-constant transfer function ...” as required by independent claim 1, so the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C 103(a).

Dependent claims 2-10, 15-20, 22 and 24 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claim 2-10, 15-20, 22 and 24 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

For the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-10, 15-20, 22 and 24 are not obvious in view of the combination of Sokal and Ide and therefore that the rejection of claims 1-10, 15-20, 22 and 24 under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn. Applicant requests that claims 1-10, 15-20, 22 and 24 now be passed to allowance.

Rejection of Claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 3,900,823 (Sokal) in view of US 5,955,921 (Ide) and in further view of US 4,803,440 (Hotta).

Dependent claims 11-14 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claims 11-14 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claims 21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 3,900,823 (Sokal) in view of US 5,955,921 (Ide) and in further view of US 5,625,322 (Gourgue).

Dependent claims 21 and 23 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claims 21 and 23 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

### Conclusion

Applicant has reviewed the other references of record and believes that Applicant's claimed invention is patentably distinct and nonobvious over each reference taken alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

October 17, 2007  
Motorola, Inc.  
8000 West Sunrise Boulevard  
Law Department – MD1610  
Plantation, Florida 33322  
Customer Number: 24273

By: /Barbara R. Doutre/  
Barbara R. Doutre  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 39,505  
Tel: 954-723-6449  
Fax: 954-723-3871  
E-Mail: [docketing.florida@motorola.com](mailto:docketing.florida@motorola.com)